REMARKS

In the non-final Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 23-31, 39-45, and 47-68 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over WITTKE et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0059705) in view of MIYASAKA et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,990,633) and YU (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0009497). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.[1]

By way of the present amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 31, and 39 without prejudice of disclaimer. No new matter has been added by way of the present amendment. Claims 23-31, 39-45, and 47-68 are pending.

Independent claim 23 recites a method that includes receiving a plurality of search queries from a user; creating a customized news document including a plurality of personalized news sections, with each news section being defined by one of the plurality of search queries; receiving an indication from the user specifying a number of news items to include in at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections; retrieving items of news content from memory using the plurality of search queries; and inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to the specified number of news items, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document. WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the combination of features in Applicants' claim 23.

---

[1] As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicants' silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine reference, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.

For example, WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU do not disclose or suggest, among other features, inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in amended claim 23. The Examiner appears to rely on paragraphs 260, 281 and 325 and FIG. 19 of WITTKE et al., column 13, lines 26-40 of MIYASAKA et al., and paragraphs 52 and 55-57 of YU for allegedly disclosing these features of claim 23 (Office Action, pg. 3). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

At paragraph 260, WITTKE et al. discloses:

The knowledge system of this invention A) effectively integrates information from diverse sources, B) verifies, adds to or enhances source metadata (product data sheet; article title), and C) searches, queries, retrieves, and aggregates information. It identifies "things" people want, need and/or desire, given all the information and misinformation that's abundant in the world. It not only locates "things" for people, but also enriches their lives. It gives them more life. It "touches" people beyond helping them find that book they're looking for. It helps people live more and grow as people. It helps the person who from when they were a child wanted to become an actress but due to life's circumstances was never able to pursue their passion: there are countless people in the world with untapped passions and interests waiting to be unleashed with proper nurturing and guidance. The new knowledge system teaches people. It knows who someone is as a person--their personality, background, interests, etc.--to more effectively and efficiently teach them.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses a knowledge system that searches and aggregates information and provides information to users based on knowledge of their personality, background or interests. This section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose, suggest, or have anything to with, inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the

plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized

news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

At paragraph 281, WITTKE et al. discloses:

FIG. 14B describes the sequence of events. After the mentor suggests a change to the
database, an administrator is notified (email or instant alert) of the request for an addition.
Upon approval via another set of user screens, the administrator approves (could also
deny) of the change and sets flags for the back-end software to automatically adjust the
database. For those people whom are currently connected as in web/internet--the next
time their browser updates they will have new database structure information. All
automatic. It's similar to adding a new directory on your computer to store stuff (Word
docs--pictures, etc.) but being able to search, query, aggregate, etc. The stuff is stored in
there automatically. (Attachment A sets forth the XML source code for performing the
Add/Drop of Database Nodes function. The source code could be in other software
languages.)

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses a process by which a mentor suggests a change to a

database and an administrator approves the change and sets flags for the back-end software to

automatically adjust the database. This section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose, suggest, or

have anything to do with, inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news

content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of

the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the

personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

At paragraph 325, WITTKE et al. discloses:

As previously mentioned and observable in FIG. 8, the PPE generates a
Personality/Preference Token 22 per each client of the system. The token--as the title
implies--stores a client selectable subset of information particular to them. In other words
depending on their personal desires, they can increase and decrease the set of information
stored per their token. This token or electronic collection of personal information has a
number of uses, one of which is shown in FIG. 36 where a user may make the token
available to third-party web sites which upon reading the token can customize the web-
site offering to that client. The ACAS system enables users to customize their collection
of information.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses the generation of a preference token 22 for each system client that stores a subset of information particular to the client. The token may, for example, be used by third-party websites to customize the web-site offering to that client. This section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose, suggest, or have anything to do with, inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

Paragraph 291 of WITTKE et al. describes FIG. 19. At paragraph 291, WITTKE et al. discloses:

> FIG. 19 describes further how information from diverse sources in different formats with varying metadata is translated, classified, and stored in databases 27. Once again we see the information received is enhanced with additional metadata and recast into other forms and formats 40, all of which are also entered into the databases 27. The data received from one publisher has a high probability of being different from that of another. The information received from a single source must be translated 39 into formats and equivalents to that dictated by the CML 12. If in fact all sources adhered to a common descriptive standard, such translation would be minimized if not eliminated. But the nature of a free marketplace and a free world makes universal compliance to a single common standard highly unrealistic. Therefore such translation is required for the foreseeable future.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses the translation, classification and storage of information from diverse sources having different data formats. In this section, WITTKE et al. discloses that information, such as, for example, data received from different publishers, is enhanced with metadata and then recast into a data format, that consists of a common descriptive standard, which then may be stored in a database. This section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose, suggest, or have anything to do with, inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the

at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of

the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

At column 13, lines 26-40, MIYASAKA et al. discloses:

> A second way divides the document content such that a presentation of a first part of the content fits in the designated area and the remaining content is omitted. Preferably, some indication of the omission such as "More" or "Remainder omitted" is included in the article presentation. A document name or some document-access information such as a URL link for the full content of the document may be provided.

> Optionally, the recipient may be allowed to specify a maximum or preferred length of an article presentation, which could cause part of the second part to be omitted. If part is omitted, the presentation could include some indication of omission as described above. The length may be specified in essentially any manner such as the number of characters, number of lines, number of paragraphs, number of columns or column-inches, or number of pages.

This section of MIYASAKA et al. discloses specifying a maximum length of an article

presentation so the content fits in a designated area and the remaining content is omitted. This

section of MIYASAKA et al. does not mention specifying a number of news items to include in

a personalized news section. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or

suggest inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content,

corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the

plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized

news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

At paragraphs 52, YU discloses:

> As mentioned before, an important idea suggested by the current invention is that interest or activity counts should be stored relative to aggregations of users in or communities instead of just individual users. When interest counts are stored relative to user communities, not only can the individual user's browsing behavior be used to select the specific content that is delivered to the user in the future, but the collective behavior of the communities can be mined and analyzed to deliver target content to the individual user as well. Community personalization can be a powerful notion in the art of personalization. The community bike news embodiment shows one way to personalize content based on community preferences and/or behaviors. Similar types of personalization based on preferences shown by sets of communities can be easily devised.

This section of YU discloses that interest or activity counts should be stored relative to aggregations of users in communities instead of just individual users. This section of YU has nothing to do with inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

At paragraphs 55-57, YU discloses that a search engine can be enhanced to deliver community based "best guess" search results based on the generic search results that that are relevant to specific communities of users. While this section of YU mentions the word "personalized," this section of YU does not disclose or suggest inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 23 is patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claims 24-30 and 68 depend from claim 23. Therefore, these claims are patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 23.

Independent claim 31 recites a news aggregation server that includes a memory configured to store instructions and news content; and a processing unit configured to execute

the instructions in memory to: obtain a plurality of search queries from a user, create a

customized news document including a plurality of personalized news sections, with each news

section being defined by one of the plurality of search queries, retrieve items of news content

from the memory using the plurality of search queries, receive an indication from the user

specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news

sections, rank, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news

content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order, and insert the selected items of

news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the

plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document. WITTKE et al.,

MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not

disclose or suggest the combination of features in Applicants' claim 31.

For example, WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU do not disclose or suggest

receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of

the plurality of personalized news sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of

ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a

ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news

content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the

customized news document. The Examiner appears to rely on paragraphs 260, 281 and 325 and

FIGS. 19 and 31 of WITTKE et al., column 13, lines 26-40 of MIYASAKA et al., and

paragraphs 52 and 55-57 of YU for allegedly disclosing these features of claim 31 (Office

Action, pp. 6-7). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 260 merely discloses a

20

knowledge system that searches and aggregates information and provides information to users based on knowledge of their personality, background or interests. This section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

As further discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 281 of WITTKE et al. merely discloses a process by which a mentor suggests a change to a database and an administrator approves the change and sets flags for the back-end software to automatically adjust the database. Paragraph 281 of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

As also discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 325 of WITTKE et al. merely discloses the generation of a preference token 22 for each system client that stores a subset of information particular to the client, where the token may be used by third-party

websites to customize the web-site offering to that client. Paragraph 325 of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

As additionally discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 291 of WITTKE et al. (which describes FIG. 19) merely discloses the translation, classification and storage of information from diverse sources having different data formats. In this section, WITTKE et al. discloses that information, such as, for example, data received from different publishers, is enhanced with metadata and then recast into a data format, which consists of a common descriptive standard, which then may be stored in a database. Paragraph 291 and FIG. 19 of WITTKE et al. do not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

Paragraph 305 of WITTKE et al. describes FIG. 31. At paragraph 305, WITTKE et al.

discloses:

> FIG. 31 pictorially describes how an originating user as well as a mentor of the
> CES system in most circumstances interacts with it for remote data and
> information entry, using a personal computer, the internet, and secure
> communications. As mentioned previously all three of the above instruments are
> well know and documented. Thus data and information can be recorded as the
> source material is created.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses the entry of data, from a user or system mentor, to a

remote database using a personal computer via the Internet. Paragraph 305 and FIG. 31 of

WITTKE et al. do not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving an indication

from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of

personalized news sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items,

selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and

inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked

order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news

document, as recited in claim 31.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, column 13, lines 26-40 of MIYASAKA et

al. discloses specifying a maximum length of an article presentation so the content fits in a

designated area and the remaining content is omitted. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does

not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving an indication from the user

specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news

sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of

news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected

items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of

the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in

claim 31.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 52 of YU discloses that interest or activity counts should be stored relative to aggregations of users in communities instead of just individual users. This section of YU does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraphs 55-57 of YU disclose that a search engine can be enhanced to deliver community based "best guess" search results based on the generic search results that that are relevant to specific communities of users. This section of YU does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 31 is patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Independent claim 39 recites similar features to (though possibly having different scope than) the features of claim 23. Therefore, claim 39 is patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 23.

Independent claim 40 recites similar features to (though possibly having different scope than) the features of claim 31. Therefore, claim 40 is patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 31.

Claims 41-45 and 47-53 depend from claim 40. Therefore, these claims are patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for the reasons given above with respect to claim 40. These claims also include additional features not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

For example, claim 44 recites receiving an indication from a user specifying a number of news items to include in the first news section, wherein populating the first news section comprises obtaining the number of news items from the first set of related news items. The Examiner relies on paragraph 342 of WITTKE et al. for allegedly disclosing these features of claim 44 (Office Action, pg. 12). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of WITTKE et al.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 342 of WITTKE et al. merely

discloses the receipt of data by a user via an email attachment or similar delivery service. This section of WITTKE et al. does not have anything to do with receiving an indication from a user specifying a number of news items to include in the first news section, wherein populating the first news section comprises obtaining the number of news items from the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 44.

For at least this additional reason, Applicants submit that claim 44 is patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claim 47 further recites receiving selected keywords from the user; and boosting selected news items of the first set of related news items higher in the ranked order when the selected news items contain one or more of the selected keywords. The Examiner relies on paragraphs 373-378 of WITTKE et al. for allegedly disclosing the features of claim 47 (Office Action, pg. 12). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of WITTKE et al.

At paragraphs 373-378, WITTKE et al. discloses:

> Possible choices in handling information after it's delivered are:
> Delete Everything--"give me totally new material every week"
> Keep an article in current listing--"I want to read this latter."
> Delete this particular article--"Done with it."
> Mark this item for storage and forwarding--"Put this in my "Send-to-Joe" folder"
> Marking means identifying an item for further processing. Users are able to select items for storage in previously setup folders--for example disk directories. The folders are also candidates for inclusion in aggregation listings. In other words on a particular day, a user might want to gather very specific information and also articles on the same topic gathered over the last couple of weeks. The articles would be evaluated for possibly inclusion, using the same logic applied to incoming news/data. FIG. 52 pictorially demonstrates two of these concepts. The two shown of potentially many updating scenarios are: 1) overwrite the old A with the new B or 2) Save a portion of A combined with the new B.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses various options a user may select to handle information, including deleting the information, keeping the information for later reading, marking the

information for forwarding to other users, or marking the information for further processing. This section of WITTKE et al., however, does not disclose, suggest, or have anything to do with receiving selected keywords from the user; and boosting selected news items of the first set of related news items higher in the ranked order when the selected news items contain one or more of the selected keywords, as recited in claim 47.

For at least this additional reason, Applicants submit that claim 47 is patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claim 48 recites receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for journalists who author news items of the news content, wherein searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user-specified preferences for journalists. The Examiner relies on paragraphs 347-350 of WITTKE for allegedly disclosing these features (Office Action, pg. 13). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of WITTKE et al.

Paragraphs 347-350 of WITTKE et al. merely disclose that a user can specify what news or information they desire to receive, how they want the news or information presented to them and how they want the information updated and stored. This section of WITTKE, however, does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for journalists who author news items of the news content, where searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user-specified preferences for journalists, as recited in claim 48.

For at least this additional reason, Applicants submit that claim 48 is patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claim 49 recites receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for genres of news among the news content, wherein searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user specified preferences for genres of news. The Examiner relies on FIG. 14A and paragraph 280 of WITTKE et al. for allegedly disclosing these features (Office Action, pg. 13). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of WITTKE et al.

FIG. 14A and paragraph 280 of WITTKE et al. merely disclose the addition or removal of tree nodes from a database, such as, for example, adding a tree sub-node called "tennis" to the database under a node called "sports." This section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose, suggest, or have anything to do with receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for genres of news among the news content, wherein searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user specified preferences for genres of news, as recited in claim 49.

For at least this additional reason, Applicants submit that claim 49 is patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Independent claim 54 recites features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 23. Therefore, claim 54 is patentable over WITTKE

et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 23.

Claims 55-63 depend from claim 54. Therefore, these claims are patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 54.

Independent claim 64 recites a method that includes crawling, using a web robot, news content documents hosted by a plurality of news source servers; fetching news content from the crawled news content documents; indexing the fetched news content to produce indexed news content; dividing a news document into a plurality of news sections; receiving a first user search query; searching the indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items. WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 64.

For example, WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU do not disclose or suggest receiving a first user search query; searching indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items. The Examiner appears to rely on paragraphs 260, 281 and 325 and FIG. 19 of WITTKE et al., column 13, lines 26-40 of MIYASAKA et al., and paragraphs 52 and 55-57 of YU for allegedly disclosing the features of claim 64 (Office Action, pg. 18). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 260 merely discloses a knowledge system that searches and aggregates information and provides information to users based on knowledge of their personality, background or interests. This section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving a first user search query; searching indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As further discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 281 of WITTKE et al. merely discloses a process by which a mentor suggests a change to a database and an administrator approves the change and sets flags for the back-end software to automatically adjust the database. Paragraph 281 of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving a first user search query; searching indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As also discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 325 of WITTKE et al. merely discloses the generation of a preference token 22 for each system client that stores a subset of information particular to the client, where the token may be used by third-party websites to customize the web-site offering to that client. Paragraph 325 of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving a first user search query; searching indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news

document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As additionally discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 291 of WITTKE et al. (which describes FIG. 19) merely discloses the translation, classification and storage of information from diverse sources having different data formats. In this section, WITTKE et al. discloses that information, such as, for example, data received from different publishers, is enhanced with metadata and then recast into a data format, which consists of a common descriptive standard, which then may be stored in a database. Paragraph 291 and FIG. 19 of WITTKE et al. do not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving a first user search query; searching indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, column 13, lines 26-40 of MIYASAKA et al. discloses specifying a maximum length of an article presentation so the content fits in a designated area and the remaining content is omitted. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving a first user search query; searching indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 52 of YU discloses that interest or activity counts should be stored relative to aggregations of users in communities instead of just individual users. This section of YU does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving a first user search query; searching indexed news content based on the first user

search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraphs 55-57 of YU disclose that a search engine can be enhanced to deliver community based "best guess" search results based on the generic search results that that are relevant to specific communities of users. This section of YU does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving a first user search query; searching indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 64 is patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claims 65-67 depend from claim 64. Therefore, these claims are patentable over WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 64.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the

Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby

made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess

fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Paul A. Harrity, Reg. No. 39,574/
        Paul A. Harrity
        Registration No. 39,574

Date: January 4, 2008

Harrity Snyder, L.L.P.
11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
Main: (571) 432-0800
Direct: (386) 575-2713

Customer Number: **44989**